

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claim 1 has been amended. Thus, claims 1-4 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

In the Office Action mailed March 19, 2004, the Examiner objected to claim 1 due to an informality. Claim 1 has been amended responsive to this objection. Withdrawal of the objection is therefore requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. It is noted that claim 1 has been amended. To the extent that the rejection remains applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicants hereby traverse the rejection, as follows.

With regards to claim 1, the Examiner indicates that the recitation of the high-elasticity base material as having a "high" Poisson ratio and Young's modulus is indefinite, as it is not known what values the Applicant would consider "high." The public would not be able to ascertain how "high" the ratio must be in order to infringe the claim. The Examiner further indicates that it is impossible to compare the present claims to the prior art at this time, as it would be impossible to ascertain whether a prior art reference anticipates these claims.

Applicants submit, however, that the Poisson ratio is always between 0.0 and 0.5 for materials having isotropic mechanical properties. Applicants further submit that it is well known in the art that materials with a Poisson ratio approaching the "upper range"

(as recited in claim 1, as amended) of 0.5 are almost incompressible materials that retain their volume regardless of the applied stress. With respect to Young's modulus, it is respectfully submitted that description in paragraph 0027 of the specification, that "a suitable base material has Young's modulus of thousands psi," is sufficient to describe the "upper range" of Young's modulus, as recited in claim 1, as amended.

For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, is in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection. As claim 1, is allowable, Applicants submit that claims 2-4, each of which depends from allowable claim 1, are likewise allowable over the cited prior art.

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referring to client-matter number 107156-00101.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referring to client-matter number 107156-00101.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Juliana Haydoutova', written in a cursive style.

Juliana Haydoutova
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,313

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 715-8434
Facsimile No. (202) 638-4810

GEO/JH

TECH/244762.1